

Appn No. 10/040,472  
Amdt. Dated January 31 2005  
Response to Office Action of December 20 2004

4

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In response to the Office Action mailed 20 December 2004, Applicant hereby requests to amend the application as follows :

The Applicant has added a new paragraph to page 1 of the specification entitled "Cross Reference to Related Application". The Applicant submits that this amendment introduces no new matter.

Claims 5 to 9 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Suzuki, or by Suzuki in view of Silverbrook. With respect Applicant disagrees. In particular, Applicant disagrees with Examiner's definition of the term hinge joint, and the Examiner's interpretation of the "cavity" defined by claim 1. Applicant considers that the gaps 6A and 6B should not be considered to be a "cavity inside a component of the hinge joint" because a cavity would generally be considered to be an enclosed space. Furthermore, the gaps 6A and 6B are defined by the baffles and members of the housing, such as the housing 6C shown in Figure 2. These features are not components of the hinge joint because they stay fixed in their positions despite the position of the hinge joint. The gaps are thus not defined by the components of the hinge joint. That the gaps 6A and 6B are not defined by the components of the hinge joint is also quite clearly shown in Figure 6. Most notably, with the screen position as shown in Figure 6, the cavity 6A is in no way disposed within the opening beneath the lower edge of the screen. Applicant respectfully urges the Examiner to reconsider his construction of these features of the claims.

Nevertheless, in order to advance the application, Applicant has amended claim 5 to replace the term "cavity" with the term "enclosed space". That is, claim 5 now defines that the hinge joint defines a substantially enclosed space internal to one or more components of the hinge. Such features are clearly shown in Figures 12 and 13 of the drawings and therefore Applicant contends that no new subject matter has been introduced by these amendments.

Applicant argues that the "cavity" of Suzuki is nothing more than the open space created beneath the lower edge of the screen when the screen 4 is elevated from the keyboard 5. With the screen open, this space is filled by the gaps 6A and 6B, which gaps are defined by other housing members, such as the housing component 6C (Figure 2). It is clear from Figure 5 of Suzuki that the gaps 6A and 6B are open spaces rather than the enclosed spaces now defined by claim 5. It is also clear that the gaps 6A and 6B are not internal to one or more components of the hinge joint as required by amended claim 5. Applicant therefore argues that for these reasons, claim 5 is distinguished from Suzuki.

Claim 5 has also been amended to more narrowly define the components of the printer that are housed within the enclosed space. Specifically, claim 5 requires that at least one of a printhead of the printer, a print media supply of the printer and an ink supply of the printer is housed within the internal enclosed space of the hinge joint. Applicant argues that Suzuki does not show any internal enclosed space of the hinge joint that houses any of the printhead, print media supply or ink supply. Notwithstanding Applicant's arguments that the gaps 6A and 6B are not internal enclosed spaces as required by claim 5, the Examiner has shown that Suzuki teaches only that the feed opening is disposed within the gaps 6A and 6B and not one of the printhead, print media supply or ink supply, as required by claim 5. For these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 5 is further distinguished from Suzuki.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Appln No. 10/040,472  
Amdt. Dated January 31 2005  
Response to Office Action of December 20 2004

5

Applicant submits that by virtue of the amendments made in respect of claim 5, claims 6 to 9 are also distinguished from Suzuki in isolation and from Suzuki in combination with Silverbrook. In addition, claim 7 has been amended to recite that the releasable cover portion is a part of the hinge joint. Applicant submits that this feature is not taught or suggested by Suzuki, which shows a releasable cover portion being a portion of the body of the electronic device.

Applicant contends that this response is fully responsive to each of the issues raised in the Office Action. Noting the Finality of the Office Action, Applicant has advanced the application by making amendments that Applicant submits clearly place the application in order for allowance. Further consideration of the application is therefore respectfully requested.


Very respectfully,

Applicant:



---

KIA SILVERBROOK



---

TOBIN ALLEN KING

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd  
393 Darling Street  
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: [kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com](mailto:kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com)

Telephone: +612 9818 6633

Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762